DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 787 UD 020 542

TITLE	District #30 U.S.E.A. Title I and Impact Aid Reading Programs. Final Evaluation Report, 1978-1979.
INSTITUTION	Buck R. Rex Education Agency, Northport, N.H.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 79
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Education; Junior High Schools; Paraprofessional School Personnel; Private Schools; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Schools; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Impact Aid; *New York (Queens)

ABSTRACT

This document presents evaluations of four Title I and Impact Aid programs implemented in New York City School District 30: (1) Title I and Impact Aid Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team Program; (2) Title I Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Team Program; (3) Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program; and (4) Title I Non-Public Schools Reading Program. Brief general descriptions of each program include information on the student populations, staff, participating schools, and types of instruction utilized. Evaluation design and implementation and an overview of all Title I and Impact Aid programs for 1978-79 are described by the evaluator. Process evaluations, based on observational data collected by evaluators, are presented for each of the four programs with recommendations appended. Quantitative evaluations are not yet available due to changes in State Education Department requirements. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187787

APR 2 9 1980

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

for the

DISTRICT 30 E.S.E.A. TITLE I AND IMPACT AID READING PROGRAMS

1978-1979

Program Title	Budget Codes and Project Numbers
Title I and Impact Aid Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team Program	Budget Code -5093 Project No. -91622 -98722
Title I Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Team Program	Budget Code -5093 Project No. -91623
Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program	Budget Code -5093 Project No. -91625 -98723
Title I Non-Public Schools Reading Program	Budget Code -5093 Project No. -91624

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An evaluation of New York City school district educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), and Impact Aid Low Rent Housing Programs (PL 81-874), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1978-1979 school year.

CD020542

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ron Edmonds
NYC Bd of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BUCK R. REX EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION AGENCY
2 Cherry Lawn Lane
Northport, New York 11768

August 1979

CONTENTS

Title		Page
I.	Introduction to E.S.E.A. Title I Programs	1
II.	General Description of the Program	1
	A. Title I and Impact Aid-Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team Program	1
	B. The Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Team Program	2
	C. Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program	2
	D. Non-Public Schools Reading Components	2
III.	Behavioral Objectives of the 1978-79 Title I Programs	3
IV.	Evaluator's Overview of all Title I and Impact Aid Programs for 1978-79	7
	A. Scheduling	7
	B. District Office of Reimbursable Programs	8
	C. Family Assistants	11
V.	Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team and Impact Aid Program	13
VI.	Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Team Program	21
VII.	Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program	28
VIII.	Non-Public Schools Reading Program	33

E.S.E.A. TITLE I PROGRAMS

District #30

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1978-79 school year is the 13th year of operation for the Federal E.S.E.A. Title I Program in Community School District #30.

This year five District Programs have been designed to help Title I eligible students improve in reading and/or mathematics. The Programs are divided into: 1) a Reading Component operative in ten public schools, 2) a Mathematics Component operative in eight public schools, 3) an Optional Assignment Component on reading functioning in four public schools, 4) a Non-Public School Component in reading placed in one parochial school, and 5) two Impact Aid Low Rent Housing Components operating in four schools. Evaluations are included in the Title I Teacher-Paraprofessional Team Program and Optional Assignment Reading Team Program.

II. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

A. Title I and Impact Aid-Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team Program
Budget Code 5093
Project Nos. 91622 and 98722

The Reading Program is active in seven elementary public schools, two intermidiate schools and one junior high school. It is conducted by teams of teachers and paraprofessionals who provide regular daily small group and individualized instruction to students. The Program is scheduled to include fourteen reading teachers, thirty-eight paraprofessionals. This includes the eight paraprofessionals and one teacher serving in three schools who are funded under the Impact Aid Reading Project. The Title I and Impact Aid Programs called for the servicing of one thousand seventy-five students.

B. The Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Team Program
Budget Code 5093
Project No. 91623

The Mathematics Program is active in eight of these same public schools. Five of these are elementary schools, two are intermediate schools and one is a junior high school. The Mathematics Component also utilizes the teacher-paraprofessional team approach in which the students receive daily small group and individualized instruction. The Program Design calls for the inclusion of eight mathematics teachers, twenty-two paraprofessionals, and six hundred students.

C. Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program
Budget Code 5093
Project Nos. 91625 and 98723

The Optional Assignment Program is active in four elementary schools and is designed to provide special help in reading for pupils who attend District #30 schools that are beyond the bounds of their own neighborhoods' attendance areas. These four schools have five Title I reading teachers and one paraprofessional. The paraprofessional serving in one school is assigned to the Impact Aid Optional Assignment Reading Program. This year's Program Proposal called for the servicing of two hundred seventy-five students through this component.

D. Non-Public School Reading Component
Budget Code 5093
Project No. 91624

This fourth Program provides help in reading to eligible students in one Non-Public School. No paraprofessionals are assigned to this Program. Small group and individualized instruction are to be provided to fifty students in this one school by one reading teacher.

III. BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES OF THE 1978-79 TITLE I PROGRAMS

At the time of the Interim Report, the evaluator anticipated receiving the pre and post-tests of all participating students in the Title I Programs to report to the District the results of the Historical Regression Analysis to determine if the Probability Level of .05 stated in the original behavioral objective was attained.

District #30 then received the instructions from the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation, The State Education Department regarding Local Educational Agency Programs Annual Evaluation Report.

The following are the primary changes which were made from the 1977-78 evaluation report forms for Title I as well as other funded programs:

1. Reporting for categorically aided programs has been made uniform.
2. Districts with more than 100 participants must report data on keypunch cards or magnetic tape.
3. Data are reported individually for each pupil.
4. A district table is completed only by districts employing the USOE Model C1 analysis. (District #30 employed the USOE Model A.)
5. A pupil summary table, completed for each pupil, indicates the extent to which the pupil participates in one or more categorically aided programs.
6. All statistical computations have been eliminated from the form.
7. A transmittal form must accompany the evaluation report.

Districts must report data on standard 80 column key punch cards or computer magnetic tape. The format for such reporting were on three tables - Table 2B, 3A, and 3B. The three tables were completed for each child in the program. The general instructions also required that all cards must be key-verified before recording on magnetic tape.

Table 2B provides the number of instructional contact hours between pre-and posttesting by funding source and component. The total annual contact hours between pre-and posttesting from all sources for reading and mathematics are also reported. In addition to the contact hours information, Table 2B also included: district code; permanent pupil number; component; program code; project number; function number; contact hours--minutes per day; contact hours--days per week; contact hours--weeks per year. Table 3A, Norm Referenced Data-Test Used, provides information about the test instrument and includes the following items: district code; permanent pupil number; BEDS school building code; grade level; pupil category; bilingual; birthdate - month, day, year; population; component; treat/non-treatment; test used-pretest; test form-pretest; pretest date-month, year; test used-posttest; test level-posttest; test form-posttest; posttest date-month, year; subtest. Table 3B, Norm Referenced Reading and/or Mathematics Data, included: district code; permanent pupil number; activity code, reading-mathematics; subtest, reading-mathematics; pretest score, raw score-reading, raw score-mathematics, NCE reading, NCE math; posttest score, raw score-reading, raw score-mathematics, NCE reading, NCE mathematics; score type;

From the above listing of required items to be included for every child in the Title I Program on the three tables, the great amount of time required can be easily recognised. With this information provided to the New York State Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation the Bureau stated in their directive that "No computations are required at the local level; rather the Department will separate the learner data by program(s) and aggregate the data needed for reporting purposes."

This statement would indicate that results of projects funded in District 30 would be received at a much later date

With this in mind, the decision was made not to execute the original Behavorial Objectives of the Programs which stated: "At the end of the school year, 70% of the participating students in the Programs will have progressed more than their average rate of growth as measured by standardised tests. The Historical Regression analysis will be performed with probability at the .05 level." This decision was based on a concern for loss of instructional time for the participating students. The district office staff, teachers, and paraprofessionals would also be required to devote an inordinate amount of time to prepare the information for both types of reporting.

The evaluator attended a meeting at which an assistant to the District Director of Reimbursable Programs presented the new forms to be completed to all the teachers in the programs. The preparation was extremely thorough, including model forms for grades K through 9. The printed instructions related to each table were minutely explained from

the first items to the last, with many items filled in with the necessary information. With this careful preparation, the meeting went smoothly with a minimum of questions. The teachers were given the dates to return the completed forms to the District Office. The forms were then submitted for purposes of transferring the data to key punch cards and then to magnetic tape. Tapes were then transmitted to the New York State Education Department accompanied by all report forms and the transmittal form in accordance with the due dates for Local Education Agency Programs (LEAP) Annual Evaluation Report outlined in the Instruction Manual.

Although the individual schools know the results of Spring testing and gains made by individual students during the 1978-79 school year, the gains and their levels of significance by grade level, as traditionally reported by evaluators, will not be available until the computations at the State level are returned to the District.

IV. EVALUATOR'S OVERVIEW OF ALL TITLE I AND IMPACT AID PROGRAMS FOR 1978-79

By the end of the 1978-79 school year, each of the program components was visited four times. During these visits the evaluator appraised the program with respect to scheduling, staffing, enrollment, facilities, supplies, equipment, and instructional programs. In this section the topics of scheduling, District Office, and family assistants are discussed.

A. Scheduling

One of the greatest problems since the initiation of Title I Programs has been the criticism involving removal of children from classrooms. No matter how carefully planned, coordinated, and evaluated, adverse opinions regarding "pull out programs" have persisted. As recently as June 1979, in an article in the New York Times, "Educators Turning Away From Out-of-Class Help" written by Dena Kleiman, it was quoted that Dr. Robert R. Spillane, deputy commissioner of the Department of Education, said the programs deprived students of valuable class time. He and other officials said that, while programs in some individual districts were effective, many others were haphazardly planned, inadequately monitored, insufficiently evaluated and often unrelated to what youngsters were supposed to be learning in their regular classrooms. The lead paragraph of this article states, "Programs that take youngsters out of class to give them special help may be doing more harm than good, according to New York State and City education officials." In the judgment of the evaluator, he strongly feels that in District 30's case the reverse is true, the programs are doing more good than harm.

To provide for a minimum of disruption in the classes sending children to the Title I Programs, administrators at the elementary level made great effort in scheduling. For example, at one elementary school the sixth

grade children eligible for Title I Reading and Math instruction were scheduled for the one period. The classroom teachers at this level would typically be left with five or six students which would permit her to conduct small group or individualized instruction while the remainder of the class was receiving either Title I Reading or Math with the teacher-paraprofessional teams. This is an example of efforts made throughout the District to minimize loss of class time and disruption of the minimum number of classes because of participation in Title I Programs.

At the junior high school level, where the problem has always been the greatest, the problem was solved satisfactorily in District 30. The Title I students were not removed from major subject areas for Title I instruction. An additional subject matter offering was created in writing improvement for those students not eligible for Title I Reading and Math. This allows for a small group in the writing program and for small groups in Title I Reading and Math without losing any major subject area time.

B. District Office of Reimbursable Programs

This year the evaluator observed the operations of the District Office of Reimbursable Programs including the District Director of Funded Programs and the various other members of the staff who work in the office.

The District Director of Reimbursable Programs supervised many funded programs. The major ones were Title I, Impact Aid, and P.S.E.N. plus the fiscal and administrative areas of Title VII (Bilingual) and Chapter 720 for District 30. Within this scope, the District Director

had these responsibilities: 1) Planning and writing of proposals, 2) Implementing proposals, 3) Overall supervision of personnel and instruction, 4) Monitoring and Evaluation of Programs, 5) Supervising of Fiscal and Administrative Department, 6) Acting as the liaison between the Superintendent and schools, and between schools and the State Education Department, 7) Contacting the principals of all the schools involved in Reimbursable Programs, 8) Assisting in setting up the Parent Advisory Councils for the individual schools, 9) Establishing and coordinating the activities of the District-Wide Parent Advisory Council, 10) Handling all business with the Central Board of Education, including budgeting at the Budget Department of Title I, Special Funding Department of the Board of Education, 11) Preparing resolutions for the Central Board regarding evaluation agencies, 12) Contacting the evaluation agency at the District level and being responsible for the evaluation design to be used by the agency, 13) Meeting with the State and Central Monitoring Task Forces whenever necessary.

In order to implement all of the above, the Director was constantly available as a resource person for all personnel involved in the program and acted as a liaison between the District Office and the community as a whole. As supervisor of personnel and instruction, he met with the personnel and spent time in the schools actually looking at the functioning of the Program Components. As supervisor for the fiscal areas of the office, he ascertained that all proper records were kept for all programs including the District's Reimbursable payroll for teachers and paraprofessionals, supervised ordering and payment of all invoices, and oversaw the ordering of all materials by all programs.

The District Director was assisted by a staff which included three Master Teachers and five secretaries and clerks who assisted in the Administrative and Financial Offices of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs.

The Master Teachers activities and responsibilities as outlined in the proposal were only a minimum compared to the excellent performance of their roles. The following list represents only a part of their total activities. Their activities included: 1) Assisting in teacher training (the major method of teacher training was the on-site visits regularly made to each component), 2) Assisting the Title I teachers and paraprofessionals in the planning and implementation of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach, 3) Helping teams in the process of individualization of work, 4) Keeping constant check to be sure daily records were adequately kept by the teachers and paraprofessionals, 5) Providing demonstration lessons for the classes, 6) Assisting the Director in the organization, dissemination and collection of the pre and post-test data materials, 7) providing material for the teams for the diagnostic testing at the beginning of the school year, 8) Assisting teachers in ordering materials and where necessary, offering suggestions as to the kinds of materials available, 9) Assisting the Director in periodic training workshops for teachers and paraprofessionals, 10) Participating in parent communication, making herself available for attendance at Parent Advisory Council meetings in the individual schools.

To make an evaluation of the District 30 Title I Office requires an exercise in superlatives. Not only is every person connected with the

office highly efficient, but extremely cooperative as well. The success of the programs and the high morale of program participants - teachers, paraprofessionals, and secretaries - is reflected in their respect for the capabilities, dedication, and leadership of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs and the Master Teachers working out of his office.

C. Family Assistants

According to the proposal the Family Assistants were to be used in the following manner:

1. Act as liaison between home and school.
2. Provide information to parents of participants, acting as a translator where necessary.
3. Assist in parent workshops, where planned.
4. Make home visits to homes of students where necessary and approved by the principal of the school. Discussions with parents regarding absenteeism, cutting, providing additional reading help, etc.
5. Logs will be kept by the family assistant, and submitted to the Office of Reimbursable Programs monthly.

Title I Family Assistants were placed in three Title I schools. These schools were chosen for this placement because they showed the greatest need for such assistance. During interviews and observations the Family Assistants assured the evaluator that they were fulfilling all the proposal requirements and more. They worked with disruptive children on a one to one basis. The Family Assistant at the junior high school level felt this one to one contact accomplished a great deal inasmuch as it got many potential dropouts to remain in school. In their discussions with parents regarding absenteeism, cutting, etc, they felt that additionally they were a great help to the parents in helping them work with their own children. They maintained close relationship with

the guidance counselors if problems went beyond their own and Title I teachers' ability to solve the problems. They were careful to check attendance to see if children were in school but cut the Title I classes. This information was relayed to the parents. One Family Assistant at the elementary level related how she provided clothing to needy children. The Family Assistants regularly attended all Title I meetings. The evaluator observed one Family Assistant very efficiently acting as hostess to a District-Wide Parents Advisory Council.

V. TEACHER-PARAPROFESSIONAL READING TEAM AND IMPACT AID PROGRAM

During four visits to each of the schools, it was found that eleven of the fourteen reading teachers in the ten Title I and Impact Aid Reading Program schools were operating their programs in regular-sized classrooms. One teacher and her paraprofessionals in an intermediate school component functioned in a small room, but since there were never large numbers of students at any one time receiving instruction, the space was adequate. One of the primary teachers worked satisfactorily in a room which was partitioned into smaller rooms. In the second intermediate school there was only one permanent classroom assigned to the program. One of the two teachers was inconvenienced by having to move from room to room. The major difficulty of this arrangement was transporting materials throughout the day. In each of the situations which was less than ideal there was a minimum of complaining from the teacher-paraprofessional teams and the programs functioned well.

One of the most positive observations was the amount of supplies and materials available to the staff, making it possible to meet the programs' objectives. There were many new and interesting materials acquired since the evaluator's former visits to the schools, supplementing supplies already on hand from previous years. The evaluator was impressed with the quantity and quality of materials, especially impressive were the many materials selected with the purpose of permitting a child to progress at his own rate. The books are for the most part attractive and had great appeal to the children. A large variety of

teaching devices and learning materials were in evidence in most rooms. Another positive observation was the apparent speedy processing of orders for supplies and materials. This was confirmed consistently during conversations with reading teachers. This accomplishment of speeding up the process was a tribute to the District Office staff's sensitivity to the importance of materials and supplies to the program's success.

Without exception the Title I reading rooms and bulletin boards were attractive, up to date, and filled with materials related to reading and children's work. Teachers in the program had obviously put forth great efforts to make their rooms attractive. They had arranged a decor that not only assured the children a pleasant place in which to work, but they had provided attractive decorations that contributed to the learning process. In every classroom the evaluator found attractive displays of children's work plus up-to-date seasonal exhibits. At the primary level the displays usually including days of the week, months of the year, colors, objects about the room, and everyday expressions were on permanent display. During visits children enjoyed directing the evaluator's attention to their individual work on display.

One obvious observation revealed that the educational aspects of the proposal were being executed in all the schools. A diagnostic prescriptive approach was used to raise the reading levels of target pupils. The results of the diagnostic tests were used with small groups and with individuals to provide the basis of language development and overcome reading deficiencies. From the diagnostic tests teachers had carefully recorded the areas in which each child was experiencing difficulty

and in need of a prescriptive type of program, such as, decoding, expanded vocabulary, comprehension, study skills, critical reading, and test taking techniques. The Teacher-Paraprofessional Team maintained constant evaluation and diagnosis of each student.

During visits to the schools the evaluator collected samples of contracts which are ideal for the diagnostic prescriptive approach. One teacher calls the contract a Reading Worksheet. On this particular contract were listed thirty-one activities with the date and space for the teacher's initials opposite each activity. The teacher in this particular school explained that when an individual student completed the thirty-one items on his Reading Worksheet, new materials would be added. The evaluator observed how excited and proud students became upon completion of areas of their contracts. Even though they compared their progress with other students, they were motivated mostly by their own self-improvement.

From District 30's Reading: Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team Program Abstract sections of the Instructional Design follow:

> "The teacher-paraprofessional team will provide for individual and small group instruction. Students will be taken from their regular classrooms in groups of 5 per teacher, educational assistant, or educational associate. These students will work on an individualized or very small group basis with the teacher or paraprofessional. The paraprofessional will be under the direct supervision of the trained Title I teacher. These students will be taken from their classes for approximately one period each day for 45 minutes, five days each week. This will give the paraprofessional five teaching periods daily. The remainder of the time will be used for training and preparation of materials. The children will be placed in groups, depending on their specific needs. The Title I teacher will give a lesson to the entire group, once each period, before students proceed with with the individualized programs. Schools which are scheduled for eight periods a day will use the additional period to service the most retarded students on an individual basis."

Instead of scheduling a group of children each period, the Title I teacher usually worked with specific children where necessary. She was involved with the teaching of students on a regular basis. She tutored children who had more complex reading proolems which the paraprofessional could not handle.

The Instructional Design as outlined in the Program Abstract is followed uniformly at all levels under the able leadership of the Master Teacher from the District Office. Many effective teaching techniques and instructional units were observed.

In one school, where only Early Childhood students are involved, the teacher worked with the entire group at the blackboard in skill development. Following this the students were divided into three groups working on exercises involving application of the skill presented. At this particular school every child gets a chance to read to the teacher, especially those children who might be emotionally upset or might need extra attention. In having the children read, the teacher explained this gave her a chance to develop more of their comprehension skills. Every Friday the teacher included a program of stories, games, tapes, working at the typewriter, a continuing sequel of the "Saga of the Monster" and a period for selecting books to be taken home for the weekend.

In all the schools reading room libraries have been established to encourage recreational and functional reading. A total program of reading is the ultimate achievement of this proposal. In addition to improving the child's vocabulary development, decoding skills, comprehension, and study skills, the child's desire and ability to read for pleasure is increased.

The evaluator observed a unit on sequence. The aim of the lesson was to put events of a story in correct order. The teacher prepared the students very carefully by discussing how to find what comes first, second, third, and expanded the lesson with other sequence words; after, next, before, last, finally; then in summary stressed the need for logical thinking. The group then read three paragraphs and completed an activity sheet placing six events from each paragraph in the order of which event happens first, second, and so on.

A unit observed in the Impact Aid Reading Program involved a story written on the board with the sentences numbered. Several children read the story aloud. From an exercise sheet with questions, children found the correct answer among the numbered sentences on the board. The lesson was well prepared and all fifteen children participated. The children then divided into three groups of five to work with the three paraprofessionals, where a variety of materials was used.

A flyer prepared by the Reading Paraprofessional Team in one school was collected by the evaluator. The flyer was selected as part of this report to illustrate parent relationships through workshops. The attention-getting phrases and questions were: What does grade level mean? What is reading? How can I help my child? What is my child doing in reading? Come see your child at work. Following these the notice read, "The goal of the workshop is to demonstrate how your child improves his reading ability in the Title I Team Reading Program. You will see your children at work using many different kinds of materials. It is important for your children to see that you are interested in what they are doing. Please don't disappoint them. Join us."

Observations of classrooms resulted in the following general impressions: the paraprofessionals were well experienced and qualified, teachers made an attempt to guarantee the paraprofessionals' self worth, they were not talked down to as assistants, and this was reflected in the observation that children displayed great respect for the paraprofessionals and for the teachers. Children were especially well motivated and followed through on all their assigned tasks. Children got individual attention and individual praise.

Probably the most impressive observation of the classrooms comes from the obvious pleasure and seriousness of the participating students. At all grade levels the students have learned the routines of the program and at the appropriate time move into the continuance of their contracts with a minimum of teacher or paraprofessional guidance. The impression from student reaction, and echoed by the evaluator, is that the period seems all too short when measured against the quality and pleasure of the reading experience.

The classroom observations are the most rewarding and pleasant aspect of an evaluation. The evaluator looks forward to each round of visits and the opportunity to be with children.

The recommendations from the final report for 1977-78 were that the program be continued, and that the District continue the utilization of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to teaching reading as well as all efforts be made to implement highly individualized instruction to all pupils, to continue present efforts to make the training sessions meaningful to the teachers and paraprofessionals, and to continue the

efforts being made to involve parents in the Title I Reading Program. The last recommendation was to seek adequate space for the teacher-paraprofessional team which currently has to travel. The recommendations regarding the continuance of efforts in three important areas refer to aspects of the program which are ongoing yearly. The last recommendation probably refers to a school that is in the Optional Assignment Program for this year. This district always makes a maximum effort to provide the best facilities available in every school in the District.

The conclusions reached at the time of the Final Report are (1) that the program as outlined in the Umbrella Title I Reading Program is being fully implemented with a complete staff, (2) in the judgment of the evaluator the value of the activities as outlined is of great educational value, (3) the teachers and paraprofessionals under the leadership of the District Office Administration, Master Reading Teacher , and building administrators are using techniques and methods that are highly effective and should prove extremely successful, (4) the extremely positive evaluation of the program must be attributable to the effective supervision of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs. The quality of the program, facilities, staff, parent relationships, and all other aspects of the program are a result of his leadership, (5) the most effective aspect of the training sessions is the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessionals by the Master Reading Teacher, (6) most of the components of the reading program have adequate-to-excellent space. Supplies and materials

were excellent, (7) the diagnostic-prescriptive approach is being used in all components, (8) students participating in the programs are serious and seem to enjoy the program, and upon examination of sample results the students have probably attained goals outlined as the original Behavioral Objectives on this year's proposal, (9) all teacher-paraprofessional teams seem to work well together.

In the judgment of the evaluator, the program was conducted in full accordance with the specifications set forth in the Project Proposal. The evaluator concurs with the program's staff members in judging that the objectives for the year were fully met.

Recommendations

With a view toward strengthening an already strong operation and adding to the scope of the program's services, the evaluator offers the following recommendations:

1. Continue the good efforts the District has made in scheduling students for the Title I and Impact Aid Programs assuring a minimum of missed class time.

2. The District should, in addition to the requirements mandated by the New York State Education Department - test scores reported on magnetic tape, require that the evaluator also provide the District with a test analysis to determine the progress of the program.

3. Continue the highly successful diagnostic-prescriptive approach and the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessionals by the Master Reading Teacher.

4. Continue the efforts to secure adequate space for the programs in those schools where additional space is needed.

5. Efforts be made to secure approval of proposals for longer segments of time (i.e., three years) in order to provide for long-range planning of programs.

6. Obviously the evaluator highly recommends the refunding of this Teacher-Paraprofessional Reading Team and Impact Aid Program.

VI. TEACHER-PARAPROFESSIONAL MATHEMATICS TEAM PROGRAM

During the four visits in the 1978-79 school year, it was found that seven of the eight mathematics teachers were operating their programs in regular-sized classrooms. One of the intermediate teachers was working satisfactorily in a room which was partitioned into smaller rooms.

One of the most positive observations was the amount of supplies and materials available to the staff, making it possible to meet the objectives of the program. There were many new and interesting materials acquired since the evaluator's former visits to the schools, supplementing supplies already on hand from previous years. Some of the Math rooms were so well equipped (in some cases supplemented by parent groups) that they could well qualify as model mathematics laboratory rooms. Without exception the Title Math rooms and bulletin boards were attractive, up to date, and filled with materials related to Mathematics and the work of the children.

In one of the beautifully decorated rooms, the bulletin board displays included Symmetry, Measurement, Sewing, Computers, Set, Shapes, Graphs, Give Information, Math is All Around Us, Special Activities, People Must Measure, Metric Vocabulary, and Nature. The Title I Math Teams also contributed to the appearance of the school by decorating school bulletin boards. One of the most interesting observed was called Newspaper Math which included Inflation-Recession; Economy-National and Local; Schedules; Sports; Map; Restaurant Bill; Graphs; Temperature; Weather; Recipes and Taxes plus a display of the first page of the New York Times

with the challenge of How many math words can you find? Every child had completed this exercise and one child's first page was displayed.

Observations revealed that the educational aspects of the proposal were executed in all the schools. The diagnostic-prescriptive approach was used to raise the students' ability in mathematics.

At one school, the very capable math teacher had spent many hours of her own time preparing a greatly detailed work-up sheet from the Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test that had been given during the norming date, Fall 1978. For example, the work-up sheet (for each child) to cover Test II Computation required two pages, with a breakdown into Addition Facts, Subtraction Facts, Addition No Renaming, Subtraction No Renaming, Number Sentences.

The Teacher-Paraprofessional Title I Mathematics Program Abstract provided for training sessions from supervisors within each school and the Master Mathematics Teacher from the District Office. Many effective teaching techniques and instructional units were observed.

Even though the evaluator saw many excellent instructional units during the four visits to the schools, he was especially impressed with the planning and execution of one very special and practical activity called Lazy-U Snack Bar. This Teacher-Paraprofessional Team is an exceptionally creative and talented team. The materials for the activity included: a Lazy-U Snack Bar Menu and play money. From the practical point of view all the items on the menu were items that children in the class might normally choose such as cheeseburger, hot dog, french fries, milkshake, milk, and ice cream. The directions stated: "You have $1.50 to spend for lunch at the Lazy-U Snack Bar. How would you spend the

money for your lunch? Write up four different orders on the Lazy-U order forms at the bottom of this page. Which of your orders is the least expensive? Circle the order number. Use your play money to pay for each order. Use the exact change." At a later visit it was learned that there had developed a follow-up to this unit resulting in a walking trip to McDonald's. The evaluator was interested and asked that the account of the trip be written up for this report and that the participating children write stories on "Our Trip to McDonald's." The story of the trip, written by one of the team members, follows:

> On June 8, 1979, 26 fifth graders in the Title I Math Program went on a walking trip to McDonald's at 88th St. and Astoria Blvd. They were accompanied by the teacher in charge of the Program, and by the paraprofessionals who work with the children.
>
> The idea of this trip was an outgrowth of a math lesson given earlier in the year, dealing with selecting items from a menu, totalling the bill and receiving change. It was apparent that the children had had little experience in this area, or that they were accustomed to handing the clerk a five or ten dollar bill and trusting that their change was correct.
>
> The children were prepared for the trip by being told that they must bring a fixed amount of money, $1 to $1.50. They were told that they must check the cost of the food, in order to see if they had enough money to purchase the items they wanted, and they were told that they must check their change.
>
> At the restaurant, we found that the children were provided with a free lunch of a hamburger, fries and a small coke. This provided an additional math lesson, as the children later calculated how much this particular lunch would have cost them. The children used their own money for sundaes etc. Some of them were puzzled by the addition of tax charges and had to be made aware that a tax would be added to the initial cost. The children calculated their change and, in everyway, entered happily into the spirit of the experience. A most enjoyable day was had by all and, hopefully, many valuable lessons were learned.

Every child who participated in the activity wrote a paragraph about the experience, two of which follow:

Our trip to McDonald's

When we walked to McDonald's it was very long. When we got there, there was a lady that showed us the kitchen, and how they made the food. In the tour there was a room that cost $100,000. After we took the tour we sat and ate a free hamburger, and french fries, and a coke. Then if we were not full enough we could buy something else. Labanta, one of my friends, bought a whopper, and a large coke, and some french fries. All of us had a wonderful time.

Our Trip to McDonald's

Mimi took us to the kitchen. We saw the fry machine and we saw a machine that cost $100,000. McDonald's serves their food ready and hot, and if their food is cold then they throw it away, then they cook it all up again. I like to walk to McDonald's but it seems like a mile, but if it is a field trip then I'll go. The food was good and I ate a hamburger, fries, and coke, and we had a sundae.

Another unit of practical value observed in another school was measuring objects to the nearest centimeter. The worksheet provided five strips numbered from 1 to 100 which the students were instructed to paste together to make a meter tape. With the tape they then measured some of the following items: length of notebook paper, width of desk, length of desk, height of desk, width of window, width of bulletin board, your height.

Observations of classrooms resulted in the following general impressions: The paraprofessionals were well experienced and qualified, teachers made an attempt to guarantee the paraprofessionals' self worth, they were not talked down to as assistants, and this was reflected in the observation that children displayed great respect for the parapro-

fessionals and for the teachers. Children were especially well motivated and followed through on all their assigned tasks. Children got individual attention and individual praise.

Probably the most impressive observation of the classrooms comes from the obvious pleasure and seriousness of the participating students. At all grade levels the students have learned the routines of the program and at the appropriate time move into the continuance of their contracts with a minimum of teacher or paraprofessional guidance. The impression from student reaction, and echoed by the evaluator, is that the period seems all too short when measured against the quality and pleasure of the mathematics experience.

The classroom observations are the most rewarding and pleasant aspect of an evaluation. The evaluator looks forward to each round of visits and the opportunity to be with children.

As was true in the Reading Component, the recommendations from the final report for 1977-78, stressing continuance of most aspects of the program, reflect a positive evaluation. The recommendations were that the District continue the utilization of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to teaching mathematics as well as all efforts be made to implement highly individualized instruction for all pupils, continue present efforts to make the training sessions meaningful to the teachers and paraprofessionals, and continue the efforts being made to involve parents in the Title I Mathematics Program. The last recommendation, to seek adequate space for the teacher-paraprofessional team, does not apply this year.

The conclusions reached at the time of the Final Report are (1) that the program as outlined in the Umbrella Title I Mathematics Program is being fully implemented with a complete staff, (2) in the judgment of the evaluator the value of the activities as outlined is of great educational value, (3) the teachers and paraprofessionals under the leadership of the District Office Administration, Master Math Teacher, and building administrators are using techniques and methods that are highly effective and should prove extremely successful, (4) the extremely positive evaluation of the program must be attributable to the effective supervision of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs. The quality of the program, facilities, staff, parent relationships and all other aspects of the program are a result of his leadership, (5) the most effective aspect of the training sessions is the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessionals by the Master Mathematics Teacher, (6) all of the components of the Mathematics Program have adequate-to-excellent space. Supplies and materials are excellent, (7) the diagnostic-prescriptive approach is being used in all components, (8) students participating in the program are serious and seem to enjoy the program, and upon examination of sample results the students have probably attained goals outlined as the original Behavioral Objectives on this year's proposal, (9) all teacher-paraprofessional teams seem to work well together.

In the best judgment of the evaluator, the program was conducted in full accordance with the specifications setforth in the Project Proposal. The evaluator concurs with the program's staff members in judging that the objectives for the year were fully met.

Recommendations

With a view toward strengthening an already strong operation and adding to the scope of the program's services, the evaluator offers the following recommendations:

1. Continue the good efforts the District has made in scheduling students for the Title I Programs assuring a minimum of missed class time.

2. The District should, in addition to the requirements mandated by the New York State Education Department - test scores reported on magnetic tape, require that the evaluator also provide the District with a test analysis to determine the progress of the program.

3. Continue the highly successful diagnostic-prescriptive approach and the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessionals by the Master Mathematics Teacher.

4. Efforts be made to secure approval of proposals for longer segments of time (i.e., three years) in order to provide for long-range planning of programs.

5. Obviously the evaluator highly recommends the refunding of this Teacher-Paraprofessional Mathematics Program.

VII. TITLE I AND IMPACT AID-OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT READING PROGRAM

During the four visits to the schools, it was found that only two of the five reading teachers in the four Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program schools were operating their programs in regular-sized classrooms. One teacher in an elementary school component functioned in a small room, but since there were never large numbers of students at any one time receiving instruction, the space was adequate. In one school the two teachers were functioning with no permanent classroom assigned to the program. The teachers moved from room to room as the rooms were vacated by a regular class. One major difficulty of this arrangement was transporting materials throughout the day.

One of the positive observations, even in the school where there was no permanent classroom, was the amount of supplies and materials available to the staff, making it possible to meet the program's objectives. These schools also shared many new and interesting materials acquired since the evaluator's former visits to the schools, supplementing supplies already on hand from previous years.

One observation revealed that the educational aspects of the proposal were being executed in all the schools. A diagnostic-prescriptive approach was being used to raise the reading levels of target pupils. The results of the diagnostic tests were used with small groups and with individuals to provide the basis of language development and overcome reading deficiencies. With the exception of the one school, reading room libraries were established to encourage recreational and functional reading. A total program of reading was the ultimate achievement of this proposal. By improving the child's vocabulary development, decoding skills, comprehension, and

study skills, the child's desire and ability to read for pleasure was increased.

The Instructional Design as outlined in the Program Abstract was followed uniformly at all levels under the able leadership of the Master Teacher from the District Office. Many effective teaching techniques and instructional units were observed.

The evaluator observed a unit on Distinguishing Fact and Opinion. The children were given a list of eighteen statements. The instructions were: "Read this with your teacher. Read each sentence. If it tells something that is known to be true, write YES on the line before the sentence. If it tells something that may or may not be true, write MAYBE on the line before the sentence." Some of the sample sentences were:

Frogs can live in water or on land.

A school playground should have a fence around it.

Bowling is much more fun than watching football.

A flashing red light usually means danger.

A pool is the best place to swim.

Sunset happens in the evening.

Everyone should eat potatoes every day

It is dangerous to ride a skateboard.

Observations of classroom resulted in the following general impressions: the paraprofessional was well experienced and qualified, teachers made an attempt to guarantee the paraprofessional's self worth, she was not talked down to as an assistant, and this was reflected in the observation that children displayed great respect for the paraprofessional and for the teachers. Children were especially well motivated and followed through on all their

assigned tasks. Children got individual attention and individual praise.

Probably the most impressive observation of the classrooms comes from the obvious pleasure and seriousness of the participating students. At all grade levels the students have learned the routines of the program and at the appropriate time move into the continuance of their contracts with a minimum of teacher or paraprofessional guidance. The impression from student reaction, and echoed by the evaluator, is that the period seems all too short when measured against the quality and pleasure of the reading experience.

The classroom observations are the most rewarding and pleasant aspect of an evaluation. The evaluator looks forward to each round of visits and the opportunity to be with children.

The recommendations from the Final Report for 1977-78 were that the program be continued, and that the District continue the utilization of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to teaching reading as well as all efforts be made to implement highly individualized instruction to all pupils, to continue present efforts to make the training sessions meaningful to the teachers and paraprofessionals. These recommendations have been carried out.

The conclusions reached at the time of the Final Report are (1) that the program as outlined in the Umbrella Title I Reading Program is being fully implemented with a complete staff, (2) in the judgment of the evaluator the value of the activities as outlined is of great educational value, (3) the teachers and paraprofessional under the leadership of the District Office Administration, Master Reading Teacher , and building administrators are using techniques and methods that are highly effective and should prove extremely successful, (4) the extremely positive evalua-

tion of the program must be attributable to the effective supervision of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs. The quality of the program, facilities, staff, parent relationships, and all other aspects of the program are a result of his leadership, (5) the most effective aspect of the training sessions is the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessional by the Master Reading Teacher, (6) most of the components of the reading program have adequate-to-excellent space. Supplies and materials were excellent, (7) the diagnostic-prescriptive approach is being used in all components, (8) students participating in the programs are serious and seem to enjoy the program, and upon examination of sample results the students have probably attained goals outlined as the original Behavioral Objectives on this year's proposal, (9) the one teacher-paraprofessional team worked well together.

In the judgment of the evaluator, the program was conducted in full accordance with the specifications set forth in the Project Proposal. The evaluator concurs with the program's staff members in judging that the objectives for the year were fully met.

Recommendations

With a view toward strengthening an already strong operation and adding to the scope of the program's services, the evaluator offers the following recommendations:

1. Continue the good efforts the District has made in scheduling students for the Title I and Impact Aid Programs assuring a minimum of missed class time.

2. The District should, in addition to the requirements mandated by the New York State Education Department - test scores reported on magnetic tape, require that the evaluator also provide the District with a test analysis to determine the progress of the program.

3. Continue the highly successful diagnostic-prescriptive approach and the training done in the classrooms with the teachers and the paraprofessionals by the Master Reading Teacher.

4. Continue the efforts to secure adequate space for the programs in those schools where additional space is needed.

5. Efforts be made to secure approval of proposals for longer segments of time (i.e., three years) in order to provide for long-range planning of programs.

6. If possible, and if program funds are available, provide this component with paraprofessionals.

7. Obviously the evaluator highly recommends the refunding of this Title I and Impact Aid-Optional Assignment Reading Program.

VIII. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS READING PROGRAM

The Non-Public School Reading Program was reduced from three schools in 1977-78 to one school in 1978-79, with one teacher and no paraprofessionals. The program operated in one half of a regular classroom divided by very temporary partitions between the Reading Program and another program. Even when the other program was not in operation, the space seemed small even though the teacher worked with a small group.

A positive observation was the amount of supplies and materials available to the teacher, some being appropriated from Title I Non-Public schools not operating this year. The teacher also had been permitted to order and had received additional supplies and materials.

Observations revealed that the educational aspects of the proposal were executed in the school. A diagnostic-prescriptive approach was used to raise the reading levels of target pupils. The results of the diagnostic tests were used with small groups and with individuals to provide the basis of language development and overcome reading deficiencies. A reading room library was established to encourage recreational and functional reading. A total program of reading was the ultimate achievement of this proposal. By improving the child's vocabulary development, decoding skills, comprehension, and study skills, the child's desire and ability to read for pleasure was increased.

The Instructional Design as outlined in the Program Abstract was followed uniformly at all levels under the able leadership of the Master Teacher from the District Office. Many effective teaching techniques and instructional units were observed.

The evaluator observed a lesson on contractions. The lesson was well presented by the teacher and the worksheet was distributed to the group. The instructions were to write the two words that mean the same as the underlined contraction. For example:

You've met my brothers. _____

I'm your friend. _____

She's a pretty girl. _____

They're over there. _____

It'll rain tonight. _____

He'll meet you at noon. _____

Observations of this classroom resulted in the following general impressions: Children were especially well motivated and followed through on all their assigned tasks. Children got individual attention and individual praise.

Probably the most impressive observation of the classroom came from the obvious pleasure and seriousness of the participating students. At all grade levels the students have learned the routines of the program and at the appropriate time move into the continuance of their contracts with a minimum of teacher guidance. The impression from student reaction, and echoed by the evaluator, is that the period seems all too short when measured against the quality and pleasure of the reading experience.

The classroom observations are the most rewarding and pleasant

aspect of an evaluation. The evaluator looks forward to each round of visits and the opportunity to be with children.

The recommendations from the Final Report for 1977-78 were that the program be continued, and that the District continue the utilization of the diagnostic-prescriptive approach to teaching reading as well as all efforts be made to implement highly individualized instruction to all pupils, to continue present efforts to make the training sessions meaningful to the teachers, and to seek adequate space for the program. The recommendations regarding the continuance of efforts in three important areas refer to aspects of the program which are ongoing yearly. This district always makes a maximum effort to provide the best facilities available in every school in the District.

The conclusions reached at the time of the Final Report are (1) that the program as outlined in the Umbrella Title I Reading Program is being fully implemented with a complete staff, (2) in the judgment of the evaluator the value of the activities as outlined is of great educational value, (3) the teacher under the leadership of the District Office Administration, Master Reading Teacher , and building administrators is using techniques and methods that are highly effective and should prove extremely successful, (4) the extremely positive evaluation of the program must be attributable to the effective supervision of the District Director of Reimbursable Programs. The quality of the program, facilities, staff, parent relationships, and all other aspects of the program are a result of his leadership, (5) the most effective aspect of the training

sessions is the training done in the classroom with the teacher by the Master Reading Teacher, (6) supplies and materials were excellent, (7) the diagnostic-prescriptive approach is being used in this component (8) students participating in the program are serious and seem to enjoy the program, and upon examination of sample results the students have probably attained goals outlined as the original Behavioral Objectives on this year's proposal.

In the judgment of the evaluator, the program was conducted in full accordance with the specifications set forth in the Project Proposal. The evaluator concurs with the program's staff members in judging that the objectives for the year were fully met.

Recommendations

With a view toward strengthening an already strong operation and adding to the scope of the program's services, the evaluator offers the following recommendations:

1. Continue the good efforts the District has made in scheduling students for the Title I and Impact Aid Programs assuring a minimum of missed class time.

2. The District should, in addition to the requirements mandated by the New York State Education Department - test scores reported on magnetic tape, require that the evaluator also provide the District with a test analysis to determine the progress of the program.

3. Continue the highly successful diagnostic-prescriptive approach and the training done in the classroom with the teacher by the Master Reading Teacher.

4. Continue the efforts to secure adequate space for the programs in this school where additional space is needed.

5. Efforts be made to secure approval of proposals for longer segments of time (i.e., three years) in order to provide for long-range planning of programs.

6. If possible, and if program funds are available, provide this component with paraprofessionals.

7. Obviously the evaluator highly recommends the refunding of this Title I and Non-Public Schools Reading Program.